



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/158,938	09/22/98	KARMI	G 365462002000

023696
Qualcomm Incorporated
Patents Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego CA 92121-1714

WM01/0223

EXAMINER

PEREZ GUTIERREZ, R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2683

13

DATE MAILED:

02/23/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/158,938

Applicant(s)
Karmi et al.

Examiner
Rafael Perez-Gutierrez

Group Art Unit
2683



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rafael Perez-Gutierrez

(3) _____

(2) Pavel Kalousek

(4) _____

Date of Interview Feb 14, 2001

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

Tiedemann, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,392,287)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Examiner and Mr. Kalousek thoroughly discussed the prior art in view of the language currently recited in claim 1. It was agreed that an amendment further specifying that the signature is not included in the message and/or that the signature is sent separately from the message will overcome the prior art. Also, the issue of the signature being equivalent to the sequence number was discussed. It was agreed that the interpretation given to the term signature by the Examiner is proper, and in accordance with page 14 lines 4-6 of the specification since no clear definition of the term signature is recited in the specification.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

William G. Trost
Supervising Primary Examiner

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.